

EXHIBIT M

Outlook E-mail

From: Hamzhepour, Tammy
Sent: 4/23/2012 8:54:01 PM
To: Devine, Timothy
Subject: RE: Prep for KP

Yes, let's walk through it tomorrow. I'm fine with not raising her expectations, so long as (to your point) there are analytics to support what we would show her. I can't speak as to the proposed settlement with AFI, as MoFo is much closer to that than I am. We can cover in the same conversation.

Tammy

-----Original Message-----

From: Devine, Timothy
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 8:38 PM
To: Hamzhepour, Tammy
Subject: Prep for KP

Tammy:

Thinking of waterfall for KP.

Would like to recommend 3, 4, 6 rather than 4, 5, 6 as low medium high. Thought is that we creat flexibility for discussion re potential losses beyond reserves. I will provide analytics to demonstrate how one could get to 3, 4 or 6. Point is not to persuade KP that such range is correct. She will have strong instinct to dispute it as unrealistically low. We are ok with her informing us otherwise, so long as she comes away knowing that ratcheting up those ranges leads automatially to lower percentage recoveries, by simple math in light of afact that there will only be X or Y real dollars available. What we will sell, though, is basedon strength of Gary's waterfall presentation as btwn GMACM and RFC in the two scenarios. The message to her will be clear - get on board.

Finally, I recommend we use 750 million rather than one billion as potential AFI contribution. I don't have basis to say it should be a billion, and it would be better to leave some room for negotiation. If we want to use a billion we will need clearance from AFI and I haven't spoken to Mike.

I recommend we take advantage of tomorrow's meeting of you, me, Kirkland and MoFo to run through the KP draft slides. Your thoughts?

Thanks.

Tim

